

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

POLICY DISCUSSION BASED ON COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON WORKING DRAFT

AQ POLICY discussion

SR. living facility

- fits well in cnty, transit. good to have flexibility.
- best to build in flexibility for all sensible uses to be allowed.
- added to list of possible uses - not nec. mandated.

Bike lanes on N-Sr(Oakville) St.

- not necessarily to be mandated
- what does it connect to?
- can currently ride on sidewalk
- would be similar to conditions on Del Ray Sts. (no bike lanes)
- would have to balance loss of parking + density
- lack of connectivity to DR

Ruby Tucker Park timing

- could ped crossing be delayed so park could be built sooner
- or make a selection one or other in 6-10 yr timeframe

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

REVISED VISION PLAN AND DESIGN GUIDELINES

Plan comments

p14 - concern re shared pkg - nd
to be a stronger statement of ^{expectations} participation
(hasn't been done well to date).
(1.20)

p15 - id maker space uses.

p16 - group homes - allow + incentivize

p20 - update chart re ped x
+ RT park.

p37 - clarification on public +
private in R.O.W. (lack of
consistency throughout doc).

A) Streets + sidewalks are all to
be dedicated as public.

⇒ Add text about streets + sidewalks R.O.W.

p61 - bikeshare location
check Stewart/MJ Park - correct.

p68 5.11 - 15' may be too much -
concern about transition
when adjacent to home etc.
(Revise lang.)

p85 5.106 - light shielded to
avoid spillover to park.

p84 - add public art.
universal design - not mandatory

p85 - ~~are~~ the stds. ~~for~~ consist.
w/infill.

p99 7.26 - add LED signs
7.28 - allow signs to be on late
into the night. (?)

p99 7.16 - clarify to include all
confirm wayfinding is
included.

7.31 "high intensity lights such as"
and LED

General - High Qual. Materials - +
LEED - part of DSUP

- Lighting - down ^{ward} directed - avoid
spillover

Appendix - anticipated # of res.

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

PROPOSED HEIGHTS FOR FANNON STREET/ROUTE 1 PARCEL

Fannon/Rte 1 Heights

- Consider ~~75~~ ⁷⁵ at corner rather than '85
- Concern about encroachment into the '45 band
- like up + down of taller/lwr hts
- provide 2 options for pub. review further comment
- does the new site Δ 's impact calculus on transit/transp. and other density related questions. What density/site data, etc.?

- Public @'s.
- What is the allowed ht in PY
- What is the ^{ac} built in PY. - add to final document.

Items that Staff will bring back for further confirmation:

- A building height on Southern triangle
 - B building massing
- Agreement from AG on:
1. Ruby Tucker Park timing - w/ Ped Xing ^{either/or when poss. comes up}
 2. Add flexibility for SE. Living
 3. Bike lanes on N-S/Dakville ^{encourage as feasible given dimension corridor} w/out losing parking

Next mtg: Final review of remaining items A-B; Endorsement of Plan.